



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,402	08/25/2003	Yoshitaka Ito	42530-5400	3674

21611 7590 09/27/2006

SNELL & WILMER LLP  
600 ANTON BOULEVARD  
SUITE 1400  
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3653

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/647,402

Applicant(s)

ITO, YOSHITAKA

Examiner

Jeffrey A. Shapiro

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagady (US 6,155,398) in view of Matuura et al (US 4,795,889) and further in view of Arimoto (US 4,365,700).

Regarding Claims 1, 3 and 19, Sagady discloses vending machine (1) that intakes tokens through token slot (50), dispenses tokens through token dispense opening (80), and intakes banknotes through banknote slot (60). The banknote validator (100), coin validator (110), display and payout unit are all connected to controller (130) and are stacked in a column. See col. 3, lines 20-31. Regarding Claims 2 and 3, note figure 5 that illustrates the validator (100) and coin validator (110) as box-shaped structures.

Sagady does not expressly disclose, but Matuura discloses a combination banknote validator (150) and banknote dispenser, said validator/dispenser having modular components, and a controller (10).

Regarding Claim 1, Matuura further discloses a safe for banknotes (131, 111, 121, 181), banknote discharging/transporting sections (161, 165, etc.), wherein the

Art Unit: 3653

banknote reject storing section (181) is located under a banknote supply storage section. See figure 4.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the combination banknote validator and dispenser of Matuura in place of Sagady's banknote validator.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to increase reliability and serviceability by incorporating an automatic bill box refilling operation without affecting the next transaction. See Matuura, col. 1, lines 39-45.

Sagady does not expressly disclose, but Arimoto discloses length sensors (53A-D). See Arimoto, col. 6, lines 11-26 and col. 12, lines 49-53.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a length sensor, as taught by Arimoto, in Sagady's banknote dispenser/validator.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to discriminate banknotes using length of the note as a criterion. See Arimoto, col. 1, lines 49-53.

3. Claims 2 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagady (US 6,155,398) in view of Matuura et al (US 4,795,889) and further in view of Kawasaki (US 4,895,358). Sagady discloses the system described above. Sagady does not expressly disclose, but Kawasaki discloses a bill cassette of a trapezoidal shape stacking bills in a non-horizontal manner. See Kawasaki, figure 1.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used Kawasaki's trapezoidal banknote cassette in Sagady's banknote dispenser/validator.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to reduce maintenance, for example. See Kawasaki, col. 1, lines 25-30 and 58-63.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagady (US 6,155,398) in view of Matuura et al (US 4,795,889) and further in view of Kawasaki (US 4,895,358) and still further in view of Haney et al (US 6,682,068). Sagady discloses the system described above.

As recited in Claim 4, Sagady does not expressly disclose, but Haney discloses a one-way clutch (176 and 484) mechanism for feeding banknotes by stripping them from or to a stack in a storage section. See Haney, col. 15, lines 26-38 and col. 31, lines 10-25.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a stripping mechanism, as taught by Haney, in Sagady's banknote dispensing system.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to strip banknotes from a stack or to a stack located in a cassette. See Haney, col. 15, lines 26-38 and col. 31, lines 10-25.

5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagady (US 6,155,398) in view of Matuura et al (US 4,795,889) and further in view of

Art Unit: 3653

Kawasaki (US 4,895,358), further in view of Haney et al (US 6,682,068) and still further in view of Winstanley (US 5,400,891).

Sagady discloses the system described above. Sagady does not expressly disclose, but Winstanley discloses a coin validator (2) having an opening on the rear portion thereof to allow for automatic resupply by an automatic resupply device. Note that Winstanley's cassette (14) allows resupply by its placement in an automatic resupply device. After resupply, said cassette can be replaced in the validator.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a coin validator cassette in Sagady's coin validator, as taught by Winstanley.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide for flexibility in servicing a coin validator. See Winstanley, col. 2, lines 5-10.

Regarding Claim 6, note that Sagady's banknote dispensing unit and token dispensing unit are considered to be removable from an inside chassis as are Saltsov's combination unit.

6. Claims 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagady (US 6,155,398) in view of Matuura et al (US 4,795,889) and further in view of Kawasaki (US 4,895,358), further in view of Haney et al (US 6,682,068), further in view of Winstanley (US 5,400,891) and still further in view of Cole (US 6,860,814 B2).

Sagady discloses the system above. Sagady does not expressly disclose, but Cole discloses, a door (34) with hinges (36) and a lock (74). Regarding Claims 7-11, it

Art Unit: 3653

would have been obvious for Sagady's vending machine to have a first door with an appropriate lock and hinges, since the vending machine must be accessed during servicing while maintaining security at all other times.

Regarding Claims 12-17, note that it would have been obvious to provide a second or third door with appropriate locks and hinges so as to secure various portions of the vending machine internals as would be required by the security needs of the vending machine.

See Cole, col. 4, lines 22-37 and col. 7, lines 40-45.

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sagady (US 6,155,398) in view of Saltsov et al (US 6,371,473 B1).

Sagady discloses vending machine (1) that intakes tokens through token slot (50), dispenses tokens through token dispense opening (80), and intakes banknotes through banknote slot (60). The banknote validator (100), banknote store (105) coin validator (110), display and payout unit are all connected to controller (130) and are stacked in a column. See col. 3, lines 20-31. Figure 5 illustrates the validator (100) and coin validator (110) as box-shaped structures that constitute first and second compartments.

Note that the banknote dispensing guide located at the lower side of the banknote dispensing unit, said dispensing guide protruding out the front face of the housing. See figure 5, for example.

Note that the token dispensing port (80) protrudes from the housing and is located on the lower side of the token dispensing unit.

Note that the token dispensing unit (110) and the bill dispensing unit (100 and 105) can be construed to be located in 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> compartments. As a comparison, elements (130 and 120) can be construed as being in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> compartments.

Sagady does not expressly disclose, but Saltsov discloses a combination banknote validator and banknote dispenser, said validator/dispenser having modular components.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the combination banknote validator and dispenser of Saltsov in place of Sagady's banknote validator.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to increase reliability and serviceability by using modular design as well as to prevent banknote jamming. See Saltsov, col. 1, lines 29-60 and col. 9 line 51-col. 10, line 2.

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-17, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant asserts that Sagady does not overcome the claims and newly added claim limitations. However, as discussed above, Sagady in combination with Matuura, Kawasaki, Haney and Winstanley provide disclosure, teaching and suggestion which reads on Applicant's claim limitations.



Art Unit: 3653

Although Sagady discloses a coin and banknote dispensing/validation device within the confines of a vending machine, said vending machine exhibits space limitations similar to casino requirements in that the more space conserved, the more space is left for item locations, therefore increasing profits. In fact, both applications can be construed as functionally equivalent since they both require compactness for maximization of profits.

Nonetheless, regardless of space requirements, Matsuura teaches, for example, the limitations of a bill reject cassette (181) located below a bill storage cassette (131).

Haney teaches use of a roller with a one-way clutch for stripping bills off of and to the stack of bills in a particular storage cassette.

Winstanley teaches incorporation of a resupply device for the purpose of improving servicing to the coin dispenser. This is considered to be sufficient motivation for including such a device on Sagady's coin dispenser.

Regarding Claims 7-17, Cole has been provided as further evidence that doors with hinges and locks are well-known in the art.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 5/31/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that the combination of Sagady and Saltsov do not read on Claim 18. However, as discussed above, Sagady discloses a bill dispenser and a token dispenser located in a vertical column. Further, Saltsov discloses a validator/dispenser for bills provided in a modular fashion.

The reason for combining Salsov would have been to provide a better validator/dispenser that minimizes jams.

Further, note that regardless of the combination of location of token or bill validator vertically, it would have been a matter of design choice for one ordinarily skilled to have placed them in any order vertically according to the requirements of the situation. For example, one ordinarily skilled in the art would recognize that coins are heavier, and therefore it would be more advantageous to locate the coin validator/dispenser closer to the bottom of the column to facilitate ease of servicing the coin storage areas.

### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3653

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (571)272-6943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick H. Mackey can be reached on (571)272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
JAS

September 24, 2006

  
PATRICK MACKEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600